

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 22-9203 MEMF (KS) Date: April 10, 2024

Title *Clinton Brown v. Clark R. Taylor*

Present: The Honorable: Karen L. Stevenson, Chief United States Magistrate Judge

Gay Roberson
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff: N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendant: N/A

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR AN EXPEDITED STATUS CONFERENCE [DKT. NO. 151]

The Court is in receipt of Plaintiff’s “Letter Motion” (“Motion”) erroneously presented to the District Judge. (Dkt. No. 151.) In the Motion, Plaintiff chiefly complains that his efforts to contact opposing counsel have been ignored. (*Id.* at 1.) More substantively, Plaintiff claims he seeks to determine if Defendant Taylor is still employed by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, and Plaintiff seeks to have the Court expedite consideration of his argument that actions by Defendant constituted a governmental taking. (*Id.* at 1-2.)

Plaintiff’s Motion is summarily **DENIED** as procedurally improper.

First, discovery closed in this case in August 2023. (*See* Dkt. No. 76.) Plaintiff’s efforts to obtain further fact discovery from Defendant’s counsel are untimely and will not be allowed. Second, Plaintiff is reminded that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment is now fully briefed and under submission. (Dkt. Nos. 82, 118, 123.) The Motion for Summary Judgment includes the takings issue, which is also fully briefed. (*Id.*) Notably, Plaintiff quotes an April 4, 2024 order issued by the District Judge finding that “[i]t is in both parties’ interests to expeditiously determine whether the fully developed factual record constitutes a taking.” (Dkt. No. 149 at 7.) In making that finding, however, the District Judge was not ordering any expedited proceedings, but was denying Plaintiff’s request for a stay pending interlocutory appeal on the basis that “[i]t would be inefficient **to delay resolution of the MSJ** to allow an appeal that focuses on different issues and an outdated factual record.” (*Id.* (emphasis added).)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 22-9203 MEMF (KS) Date: April 10, 2024

Title *Clinton Brown v. Clark R. Taylor*

As the Motion for Summary Judgment is under submission, a Report and Recommendation will issue in due course. Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

gr